

...the sputtered magnetic material 26 of this invention as depicted in FIG. 8 comprises a homogeneous mixture of particles 28 of different sizes, each exhibiting a unique hysteresis characteristic with respect to its magnetizability. The overall magnetic characteristic exhibited by the layer of sputtered material 26 is, therefore, the magnetic sum of individual particles 28 thereof.

The current application however does not use the particles (28) described by Katti. The application uses a continuous film containing nucleation sites which represent information. Nucleation sites are locations in a continuous film of magnetic material at which a magnetic domain is more easily created and from which it will grow. Nucleation sites are well known in the art, see for example Section 16.2 of the text book titled "The physical principles of magneto-optic recording" by Masud Mansuripur. Nucleation sites occur in non-particulate media and are the mechanism by which magnetic domains form. In the current application information is stored by selectively placing these sites into the medium.

Thus, although Katti describes *a substrate*, and *a magnetic layer*, Katti does not describe *nucleation sites*, nor does he describe *a means of selectively introducing nucleation sites*.

Rejection Of Claims 3 And 4

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected due to their status as a process of making nucleation sites in claims drawn to a product. It appears to the applicant that there has been a mistake here since claims 2, 3, and 4 all refer to a process of making nucleation sites and thus should have all been rejected on the same grounds.

The purpose of these claims 2, 3, and 4 is to claim a different structure and features on the substrate, and thus a different product. In each of these products, the substrate that is used causes the nucleation sites to form in the magnetic layer as described in the specification.

Claims 2, 3, and 4 have been reworded to reflect this.

Objection To The Rejection Of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) on the bases of being unpatentable of Katti et al in view of Almasi et al (US-3,680,065) The applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection on the basis of a misunderstanding of the teachings of Katti in US-5,375,082 as explained earlier in the correspondence.

Very respectfully,



Philipp Herget
Applicant Pro Se
2015 Wendover St. Apt 5
Pittsburgh, PA 15217-1938